



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

11/1

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,898	11/02/2001	Maurice Haman Abraham	B-4358 619258-8	7200
7590	12/15/2005			EXAMINER
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			ENGLAND, DAVID E	
P. O. BOX 272400				
3404 E. Harmony Road			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Intellectual Property Administration				
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			2143	
DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/005,898	ABRAHAM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David E. England	2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 9 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jawahar et al. U.S. Patent No. 6298356 (hereinafter Jawahar) in view of Hankejh et al. (6915336) (hereinafter Hankejh).

4. Referencing claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches a computer apparatus for implementing a workflow defined by a sequence in which activity nodes that include a plurality of interactive nodes must be performed, the computer apparatus comprising a processor for arranging and initiating the execution of the activity nodes in accordance with the defined sequence, wherein each interactive node is arranged to allow a user to input data for use in the execution of an activity node, the processor being arranged to analyze the user input data to determine the interactive node in the sequence of activity nodes to which the user input data is associated, (e.g. col. 1, lines 10 – 28, col. 15, line 37 – col. 16, line 6 & col. 16, lines 40 – 67,

“*Help*” button makes an active node an interactive node). Although Jawahar teaches implicitly a type of workflow in regards to users asking for the aid of an agent by initializing the “*Help*” button, there is no explicit teaching of a type of sequence as what is well known in the art as workflow. Hankejh more explicitly teaches workflow in the regards to a type of sequence in which activities are processed, (e.g., col. 9, lines 40 – 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hankejh with Jawahar because utilizing a schedule to answer users requests for aid give the system the ability to not let users that have been waiting for aid to be forgotten by agents if they are not aided in a timely fashion, i.e. first come first served.

5. Referencing claim 2, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar and Hankejh teach all that is similar in nature here as can be found in claim 1 in regards to workflow, furthermore, Jawahar teaches the processor being arranged, in response to the analyze, to initiate execution of the associated interactive node such that if the user data is associated with an interactive node that has been executed the interactive node is re-executed, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 21, lines 35 – 44).

6. Referencing claim 3, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar and Hankejh teach all that is similar in nature here as can be found in claim 1 in regards to workflow, furthermore, Jawahar teaches the processor is arranged to compensate executed activity nodes that follow in the defined sequence from the re-executed interactive node, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 14, lines 40 – 55, “*back and forward*”).

7. Referencing claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar and Hankejh teach all that is similar in nature here as can be found in claim 1 in regards to workflow, furthermore, Jawahar teaches a computer system comprising a computer apparatus according to claim 1 coupled, via a network, to a second computer apparatus, the second computer apparatus having a user interface to allow a user to input data for an interactive node, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 14, lines 40 – 55, “*back and forward*”).

8. Referencing claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches the network is the internet, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28).

9. Referencing claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches the user interface is an internet application allowing sequential movement between web pages, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 14, lines 40 – 55, “*back and forward*”).

10. Claims 7 – 9 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De



DAVID E. ENGLAND
EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100